Open Communion.

BY S. W. WILT.

It is not my intention to try to monopolize on the subject of Open Communion, I have a desire for the truth only. But the manner in which the discussion was opened I could not properly present my views in my former communications.

What do we understand by communion? I reply, it means, intercourse; fellowship. It comes from the Latin *communis*, common, hence signifies a part, a share. The means of intercourse; fellowship not limited. This is the plain, common, logical use of the word. In 1 Cor. 10: 16, our translaters use the word *communion* which might with propriety be rendered, *participation*, a sharing; a distribution. Notice all these words embody the idea expressed in the word, *communis*, common. This I presume is sufficient for the present so far as the word is concerned. It is not a word that is used when we imply restriction.

Now if we can find anything in the design, intent and purpose for which the communion was instituted that will warrant us to use it in a restricted sense then we are willing to put restriction upon it. This can be ascertained by refering to the statements of the Evangelists which we will now do. Matt. 26: 28.—For this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins. Mark 14: 24.—This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many. Luke 22: 20. This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you. If any one can find the idea of restriction in these let him do so. I presume we do not differ on the design, intent and purpose for which his blood was shed. Next let us ascertain what Paul has to say in regard to this matter. 1 Cor. 11: 24. This do in remembrance of me. Verse 25. This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. Verse 25. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come. From this we learn that we are to keep this institution, or to do this *in remembrance* of his death, and show his death. This is the great object of the communion.

The communion is some what different to baptism, as it regards conditions and qualifications as prerequisites. The gospel gives us the requisites to baptism, but not so in communion. Self-examination is the only one referred to, and then the person himself is left to decide or judge. Nothing is said about the church having a right to say who shall, or who shall not partake of the communion. Hence all who are living in fellowship, (are in good standing) in our great Christain brotherhood have a right to the Lord's table if they so desire; and that without question or the judgement of any one. The institution is, commemorative and symbolical. It is not a test directly, or an expression of organic membership or discipleship one with another; but of each one with Christ, as his personal Savior.

Communion.

"As oft as you do this ye show forth my death" Bread and wine are the symbols we believe. Our "Lord and Master" instituted feetwashing, supper and communion in the night of his betrayal. Said he, "if ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them." We as believers and followers of Christ so teach and practice. Any Christian people who so follow this teaching, I can commune with; but when I come to examine myself I desire to do as our Savior gave the example and when I find that the example is not adhered to, then I cannot conscientiously participate in the communion. But when we as a church are gathered together for commemorating the death and sufferings of Christ as taught in His word, others being present who are not bearing the same name but belong to some Christian organization and desire to follow in the commandments of God, who am I that I can say you cannot have a part in this matter? It rather should be a pleasure that we have at least a privilege to lead them so far in following Christ. Now brethren, if this is open communion I cannot help it. If it is close, then I am for close communion. Should we withold the commandment from those who are willing to follow them?

E. B. SHAVER.

Explanations Wanted.

For years I have been opposed to what is called a supported ministry. But I notice that quite a number of brethren favor it. Perhaps I do not understand it. Am willing to be enlightened. Will brethren who advocate it, please explain what they mean by it? Is it something *effective*? Will it work?

Will those who advocate it, actually support it? Who is to dictate as to the amount of support the minister is to have? Is the minister to be treated as a freeman or as a subject of charity? Is there not danger that preachers will go where they will get the biggest and fattest support? Does it mean access to useful and needed knowledge? Does it give time for study? Come, brethren who advocate it, give us some of your reasons for the position you occupy, and define yourselves. Those of us who believe in system and that the preacher himself should at least be partial judge as to the *quantity* and *quality* needed to support his family, are not beyond reach of being convinced. What we want is fair logic. We shall pause to learn more what is meant by a supported ministry. Please hurry and give us the desired information as we are just on the eve of presenting an array of bible, moral social, intellectual experimental, sympathetic and scientific facts it favor of a *salaried* ministry. We may be wrong in our conclusion. We are not after "self-aggrandizement," neither have we a "pet hobby" to ride. What we desire is the right.

W. J. H. BAUMAN.

A Roman Catholic's View of the Sabbath.

ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS REWARD.

The following, with the above heading, appeared in the Sunday issue of the Emporia Kansas Daily Republican, April 13, 1884. It is to the point and has made quite a stir among the readers of that paper.

"The Rev. Cannon Kirshaw Barton, Roman Catholic priest in Manchester, England said in 1867 that Suuday is regarded by the Roman Catholic church as a day entirely of their own apointment.

Father Enright said in Hartford, Kansas in 1884 that no church or sect, except the Roman Catholic church has the power to make laws binding on the conscience. To prove his assertion, he said all Christendom acknowledges this power of the Roman Catholic church by the observance of Sunday. How can other denominations keep this day. The Bible commands you to keep the Sabbath day and Sunday is not the Sabbath day; no man dare assert that it is, for the Bible says as plainly as words can make it, that the seventh day is the Sabbath, that is Saturday, for we know Sunday to be the first day of the week. Besides the Jews have always kept the seventh day Sabbath and do until the present day.

I am not a rich man but I will give one thousand dollars to any man who will prove by the Bible alone that Sunday is the day we are bound to keep; no, it can not be done; *it is impossible.*

The observance of Sunday is solely a law of the Roman Catholic church and therefore is not binding upon others. The Roman Catholic church changed the Sabbath to Sunday and all the world bows down and worships on that day in silent obedience to the mandate of the Roman Catholic church. Is it not a living miracle, that those who hate us so much and so bitterly, obey and acknowledge our own power every week and do not know it?

Who will take the one thousand dollars? It will go a good way toward building a meeting house, or piecing out the salary of some poor preacher whose congregations are financially embarressed. The Roman Catholics are rich and able to make their promise good. Signed.

FATHER ENRIGHT.

Hartford, Kansas.

The above is an exact copy of the paper of the above date, now in my possession. And I will also give one hundred dollars to any man who will show by divine authority that the first day of the week is the Lord's day mentioned in Rev. 1: 10.

L. H. SMITH.

Mesquite, Texas.

Couple Heaven With It.

An aged Christian had paused to rest himself as he trudged along under a heavy load on a warm summer day. An acquaintance had just accosted him, when a splendid carriage rolled past, in which a haughty man rode, whose whole appearance be spoke a life of luxurious ease. "What do you think of the Providence of which you sometimes speak?" said the acquaintance. "You know that that is a wicked man; yet he spreads himself like a green bay tree. His eyes stand out with fatness, he is not plagued as other men; while you, believing that all the silver and gold is the Lord's, serving him and trusting in His providence, and toiling and sweating in your old age, get little more than bread and water. How can you reconcile this with Providence?"

The aged saint looked at the questioner in amazement, and with the greatest earnestness replied: "*Couple Heaven with it!* Couple Heaven with it, and then!" Yes, that addition sweetens many a bitter cup, and enriches many a poor lot. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory, while we look not at the things which are seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things that are not seen are eternal." —*Times of Refresh.*

Wisdom and Folly.

Christians are admonished not to be yoked together with unbelievers; yet how often do we see wisdom and folly blended together! For instance, here is a man who takes special pains to insure his property against fire and lightning; yet he seems to care nothing about insuring against eternal fire. If some infectious disease visits his neighborhood, how anxious he becomes about disinfectants, quarantine and all other preventives and remedies, even to moving away; yet how indifferent he is about the infectious leprosy of sin. Willingly risking his family in the midst of evil influences, like Lot in Sodom, if it be a good place to get rich. The world-wise man will carefully avoid selecting a malarious and unhealthy locality for his residence without giving a thought to the moral influences.

The wise men of the world pay a great deal more respect to the things of time and sense, which are as transient as a pleasant day, than they do to things which pertain to the eternal weal or woe. They strain out heavenly wisdom and swallow the camel of worldly wisdom.

Bodily comfort is more important to their mind than soul culture. Their ambition is to gather a few dollars and acquire property, regardless of the thought of laying up treasures in heaven. What short sighted creatures they are, almost blind to their duty to God and the destiny of their souls. With all their shrewd sagacity, these wise men are afflicted with the most consummate folly. It is a fearful thing to neglect the salvation of their soul for the sake of transient pleasure.—*James Stolbert.*

Of One Blood.

Not only should the rich and privileged strive to make Sunday a day of human brotherhood, but so should the poor man and so-called working man, so should all men. Indeed, observations and reflection teach us that the poor need this injunction quite as much as the rich. In many cases it is not because the rich man sets an undue value on his riches, but it is because his poor neighbor sets an undue value on them, that the two are not neighborly as they should be. It is often not the rich man who is conscious of the difference between himself and his less fortunate or wealthy neighbor, but it is the poor neighbor who is so morbidly and intensely conscious of it, that the two do not freely meet together in God's house and elsewhere. Quite as much as the rich, then, do the poor need to be taught that riches do not constitute dignity and worth, and that all men are brothers, children of a common Father. Bishop Potter's noble entreaty needs, therefore, to be spoken by him and men like him, to the poor as well as the rich. All men alike should be taught to be genuinely brotherly and sympathetic, and to realize and illustrate the dignity or duty of their redeemed manhood in helping their neighbors, rich and poor, by their friendless, keeping "touch" with them in their daily, neighborly intercourse. Undoubtedly the rich need to have this duty constantly pressed upon them, but so also do the poor.

And the only way in which the doing of it can be compassed is by moving both alike, the poor as well as the rich, to regard all their neighbors as brothers, to each of whom is due the loving ministry of human brotherhood.—*The Churchman.*

Nature is frank and will allow no man to abuse himself without giving him a hint of it.

Worldly cumber will hurry a man from his bed without prayer; to a sermon, and from it again without prayer. It will choke prayer; it will choke the word; it will choke convictions; it will choke the soul, and cause that awakening shall be to no saving purpose.—*John Bunyan.*

As soon as a soul willingly receiveth Christ for its Savior, then is a man at rest and within a quiet harbor. Christ and his righteousness, like Jonah, calmeth the sea of God's wrath. When Christ is received by faith, he quiets and stills the conscience that formerly, from a sense of God's wrath, raged as the troubled sea.—*Colville.*